Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 February 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *23-27,34,35 and 37-40* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16,28-33 and 36-40* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *17-22, 29, 31, and 33* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

         1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   In view of the appeal brief filed on February 12, 2004, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejections are set forth below.

        To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

        (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

        (2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

        If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

        The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3.   **Claims 1-14, 28-31 and 33** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The phrase "immediately sending" is used in **claims 1, 3 and 4,** "to send the message after notifying the second user and after the second user signals acceptance", while the accepted meaning of 'immediately' in reference to a Merriam Webster Dictionary is "sending without interval of time." The term is indefinite because the specification and claims do not clearly disclose how fast is being considered "immediate".

Further, use of "immediately" sending in **claim 1** (ln.7) causes confusion and may be considered inaccurate because **claim 1** states "immediately sending" while subsequent **claims 3, 4** implicitly state that the sending is not "immediate" but instead is 'in response to' a signal from the second user, thus **claim 4** limitations negate the 'immediacy' which is presented as having already occurred in **claim 1**. Since a response or subsequent action is required in the dependent from **claims 3, 4,** the term "immediately" is either not being used with the meaning normally associated with the term, or it is merely misplaced and thus incorrect with respect to what the description of the invention intended it to mean. For examination purposes, the examiner will consider that "immediately" as used in the claim will be with

respect to the response or signal from the recipient or determination of presence as presented in the

subsequent claims. **Claims 8 and 11** and **claims 12-13** contain similar confusion.

Further confusion arises with respect to the combination of **claims 1, 28 and 29** wherein **claim 1**

states the sending to the second terminal is immediate, and **claim 29** says the sending of (what may be the

same message) is to an inbox.

In **Claim 7**, (line 1-2) "the received voice message" lacks positive antecedent basis as reference

to "the 'completed' voice message" is used in claim 1 to refer to what may be the same message, it is not

clear if the dependency on claim 1 as such is intended as "the received voice message" would be

appropriate to use if the dependency is instead intended to be on claim 5.

Claim 29 (line 2) "the received message" lacks positive antecedent basis, it is not clear if this is

intended to refer to the previously recited "said completed message" of **claim 1**. The examiner will

consider intent to refer to "said completed message" of **claim 1**, for examination purposes.

In **Claim 33**, "said means for 'immediately' sending" (ln.1-2) lacks positive antecedent basis as

claim 15 does not state the means for sending is a means for "immediately" sending.

Claims not specifically referred to above are rejected for being dependent on rejected claims

noted above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis
for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:
   A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
   (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or
   in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for
   patent in the United States.
   (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b),
   by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a
   patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the
   invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty
   defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application
   filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and
   was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5.   **Claims 1, 5 and 7,** as best understood due to confusion noted above, are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Parvulescu et al. (US 5,724,410).

Regarding **claim 1**, Parvulescu teaches a method for use in a telecommunications network for

providing messages between users (column 1, lines 65-67; column 5,lines 12-28) , including steps of:

receiving a completed voice message (column 2, lines 28-33; FIG. 5; column 3, line 52) from a

first terminal (20, FIG. 1) for forwarding (via messaging service providers, column 4, lines 41-67) to a

second user at a second terminal (70, FIG. 3; column 4, line 28-35), the completed voice message already

spoken to a conclusion by a first user at the first terminal (via recording and storage in the users terminal,

· column 2, lines 28-33; column 3, line 47-column 4, line 12) prior to the transmission from the first

terminal (column 3, line 43 -column 4, line 23; column 5, lines 21-23)

[The user of the first terminal 20 records a voice message by pressing a record actuator on the

terminal and speaks a voice message which is processed and stored into a memory in the users terminal.

The user selects the recipient to receive the recorded message by pressing an actuator on the users

terminal. The service provider processes the received voice message using the appropriate

communications protocol and coding standard so as to forward the recorded voice message received from

the first terminal through the messaging service providers network to the receiving terminal]; and

immediately sending the completed voice message to the second terminal (column 5, lines 12-28)

[The encoded voice signal is sent through the network to the designated receiving terminal upon actuation

of the transmission actuator button at the transmitting terminal].

Regarding **claim 5**, Parvulescu teaches receiving a voice message from the second terminal

spoken by the second user (column 6, lines 25-41); and

immediately sending the received voice message to the first terminal (column 6, lines 25-41) [The

receiving terminal is capable of having the same two way messaging capability of the sending terminal

described above and thus since it has the capability of transmitting a response voice message back to the

messaging terminal described above it is capable of using the messaging service provider in the same

manner as the first terminal and thus immediately sends a spoken voice message recorded therein to the

first (or other) terminal(s) as described above].

Regarding **claim 7**, Parvulescu teaches storing the completed voice message in the second

terminal for playback by the second user at the convenience of the second user (FIG. 7; column 6, lines

13-24) [The voice message is stored in the memory of the receiving terminal and upon actuation of an

actuator by the recipient (the user of the receiving terminal) the message will be reproduced at a speaker

of the receiving terminal].

6.   **Claims 8-13, 15-16, and 36**, as best understood due to the confusion noted above, are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Aravamudan et al (US 6,301,609).

Regarding **claim 8**, Aravamudan teaches apparatus for use in a telecommunications network for

providing messages between users (FIG. 1 is a telecommunications network with multiple users (140)

capable of using multiple client devices (142, 144, 146, 148,150), Communication Services Platform

(CSP) 160, FIG. 1 provides messaging function in conjunction with components of service provider

network 120) comprising:

means for receiving a voice message from a first user terminal spoken by a first user for a second

user at a second terminal (CSP 160, column 7, lines 21-40 receives data including voice mail messages as

pending events from a user or client 140 directed to another user/client that subscribes to the service(s)

provided by the service provider);

means for checking availability of the second terminal or second user using a presence service

(Instant Message Server 130 on FIG. 1; column 7, lines 1-20; The client software of the user CPE

generates a message indicating the user's on line status and device address and conveys the message to

the Instant Message Server 130 which in conjunction with the CSP keeps track of each users status at a

respective client device or devices, the Instant Message Server notifies the CSP 160 of the user's

presence, the CSP maintains a database of client/user being online, which CPE device is being utilized

and the address thereof];

means for immediately sending the received message to the second terminal if the second

terminal is available (via column 9, lines 10-44 the CSP upon receiving notification of the user's presence

online checks for pending events including that a voice mail message has been received for the user , the

IM server sends an instant message to the user to notify the user of the voice message event and as to

whether the user wants the voice message forwarded and in what format as well as when and to which

device the voice message is desired to be forwarded to. Thus as per the claim language, the availability of

the user device is determined, the acceptance by the user of the message is determined and signaled, and

the delivery immediately in response thereto is provided to the recipient terminal).

Regarding **claim 9**, Aravamudan teaches means for storing the voice message (as a pending

event) until the means for checking availability determines the second terminal is available (the CSP

maintains the user/recipient status as being online (available) and only notifies the recipient after the

recipient status is indicated as online (to the service via at least one CPE device) as is stated in column 7,

lines 1-20; column 9, lines 10-44 noted above.

Regarding **claim 10**, Aravamudan teaches means for notifying the second user at the second

terminal of the received voice message from the first user prior to the received voice message

transmission to the second terminal (as noted above in column 7, lines 21-40 the IM server and CSP

notify the user that a voice message has been received].

Regarding **claim 11**, Aravamudan teaches the received voice message is sent to the second

terminal only after the second user signals acceptance (as was pointed out above with respect to claim 9

the CSP maintains the user/recipient status as being online (available) and only notifies the recipient after

the recipient status is indicated as online (to the service via at least one CPE device) and as is stated in column 7, lines 1-20; column 9, lines 10-44 noted above).

Regarding **claim 12**, Aravamudan teaches means for receiving a voice message from the second terminal spoken by the second user in reply to the voice message from the first user

means for immediately sending the voice message received from the second user to the first terminal (column 9, lines 10-44; the CSP 160 and IM Server 130 provide the messaging service(s) as described above with respect to claims 8-11, with respect to claim 12, each of the client users is enabled to interact with each of the other client users which have the associated device addresses in the system, replying (by sending a message) to any recipient on a client buddy list whether in immediate reply to (and including the content of the original message) or merely upon reading a sent message and composing a new message in response is clearly enabled by the particular functionality of the system as discussed above).

Regarding **claim 13** Aravamudan teaches checking the availability of the first terminal before sending the voice message completed at the second terminal to the first terminal (as similarly noted above with respect to claim 12, each of the clients of the service is entitled to use the messaging features as described with respect to the recipient client discussed above).

Regarding **claim 15**, Aravamudan teaches a voice message system including a plurality of terminals and a voice message service center (FIG. 1 is a network with multiple users (140) capable of using multiple client devices (142, 144, 146, 148,150), Communication Services Platform (CSP) 160, FIG. 1 provides messaging function in conjunction with components of service provider network 120 and thus is considered a voice message service center) the service center comprising:

means for receiving a voice message from a first user terminal (CSP 160, column 7, lines 21-40 receives data including voice mail messages as pending events from a user or client 140 directed to another user/client that subscribes to the service(s) provided by the service provider);

means for storing the received voice message from the first terminal (via column 6, lines 3-31 the CSP maintains the data in various databases for the clients being serviced by the service provider, pending events which are included as causing notification include pending voice message(s))

a presence service for checking availability of an intended second user at a second terminal, (Instant Message Server 130 on FIG. 1; column 7, lines 1-20; The client software of the user CPE generates a message indicating the user's on line status and device address and conveys the message to the Instant Message Server 130 which in conjunction with the CSP keeps track of each users status at a respective client device or devices, the Instant Message Server notifies the CSP 160 of the user's presence, the CSP maintains a database of client/user being online, which CPE device is being utilized and the address thereof];

means for sending the stored received message from the first terminal to the second terminal if the second terminal is available (via column 9, lines 10-44 the CSP, upon receiving notification of the user's online presence, checks for pending events including that a voice mail message has been received for the user, the IM server sends an instant message to the user to notify the user of the voice message event and as to whether the user wants the voice message forwarded and in what format as well as when and to which device the voice message is desired to be forwarded to. Thus as per the claim language, the availability of the user device is determined, the status of user and acceptance by the user of the message is determined, and the delivery immediately in response thereto acceptance is provided to the recipient terminal as desired).

Regarding **claim 16**, Aravamudan teaches means for notifying the second terminal of the voice message received from the first terminal wherein the received voice message from the first terminal is sent to the second terminal upon receiving an acceptance signal from the second terminal in response of the notification (column 9, lines 10-44, the user provides disposition information concerning delivery of the event the instant message notifies the recipient of)

Regarding **claim 36**, Aravamudan teaches an instant messaging service including

a presence service (CSP 160 and Instant Message Server 130), responsive to presence

information (column 7, line 21-40), for providing status information (to the database for providing

messaging services to the plurality of clients, the client CPE software generates a message indicating the

user's on line status and current user address and conveys the message to the Instant Message Server)

a short voice message service (one of the services provided via the CSP160 includes notifying the

recipients of pending events, a voice message is considered a pending event, the claim does not limit

"Short voice message" as being sent via IM nor does it limit the term short to include or exclude any

particular length(s) of messages, consider that a short voice message can be left on a normal voice

message service, nothing is provided that limits SVM from being from or to any particular type of device

which would exclude any other type of device), responsive to an SVM provided by an SVM sending

principal (one of the client devices 140 on FIG. 1), for providing the SVM to a receiving principal

(another of the client devices) if the status information indicates availability (column 7, line 21-40 the

user's presence online and disposition of the message notification) for acceptance of the SVM (column 7,

lines 21-40)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as
> set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be
> patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at
> the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject
> matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was
> made.

8.   Claims 2-4 and 6, as best understood due to the confusion noted above, are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parvulescu in view of Aravamudan.

Parvulescu teaches that which is as provided with respect to claims 1 and 5 above and from which

claims 2-4 and 6 depend respectively.

With respect to **claims 2 and 6**, Parvulescu does not teach checking availability of the second

terminal or second user using a presence service with the sending of the message only after determining

the user or terminal is available, nor of the use of a presence service in returning a message to a sender .

Aravamudan teaches to use various client devices for messaging capability between clients of the

service and does not limit the devices which can be used in the service while also teaching to check

availability of a second terminal or the second user (recipient at a terminal) using a presence service and

sending a voice message only if available (column 7, lines 21-40 and as discussed above), Aravamudan

enables messaging between clients of the service responsive to (in reply to) various received messages.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to modify the message service provider network of Parvulescu to include a presence service for checking

availability of the recipient (whether the recipient was an original recipient or a recipient receiving a reply

to a previously sent message) before sending a voice message as taught by Aravamudan for the purpose

of ensuring the recipient was able to review the message in a timely manner and avoid sending a message

with stale contents to a user that was not available to the review the message at the time of sending.

Regarding **claims 3** , Parvulescu as applied to **claim 1** differs from **claim 3** in that it does not

teach a step of notifying the second user at the second terminal of the completed voice message prior to

the step of sending.

However, Aravamudan teaches notifying a second (recipient) user at a second (recipient) terminal

of a completed and received voice message prior to sending (Aravamudan notifies the user that a voice

message has been received and asks for disposition thereof as discussed above and via column 7, lines 21-40).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the network of Parvulescu so as to notify the second user at the second terminal of the completed voice message prior to sending as taught by Aravamudan because this modification would enable the system of Parvulescu to avoid sending a voice message to a recipient when the recipient did not wish to be disturbed by a received voice message such as when in a meeting with multitudes of other people.

Regarding **claim 4**, Parvulescu as applied to **claims 1 and 3** above differs from **claim 4** in that Parvelescu does not teach sending the received voice message to the second terminal only after the second user signals acceptance.

However, Aravamudan teaches sending the received voice message to the second terminal only after the second user signals acceptance (column 7,lines 21-40; column 9, lines 10-44 as was discussed above, the recipient responds with disposition for delivery of the message)

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Parvulescu by sending the received voice message to the second terminal only after the user signaled acceptance as taught by Aravamudan.

This modification would enable the system of Parvulescu to only deliver the message to the recipient when the recipient desired and was able to review the message.

9.   **Claim 14** as best understood due to the confusion noted above, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aravamudan in view of Parvulescu .

Regarding **claim 14**, Aravamudan teaches that which as is applied to claim 8 above but does not

teach means for storing the voice message received in the second terminal for playback by the second

user at the convenience of the second user

Parvelescu teaches storing received messages in the terminal for review by the recipient at

opportune and desired time.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to modify Aravamudan to include a terminal capable of enabling the user to store received messages for

convenient review as taught by Parvelescu for the purpose of enabling the user of the Aravamudan system

to archive important messages on their terminal for review at a most reasonable time.

9.   **Claim 28 is** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parvulescu in view of

Aravamudan and in further view of Day et al. , "Request for Comments : 2778" (RFC 2778).

Regarding **claim 28**, Parvulescu as modified in view of Aravamudan as applied to **claim 2** above

differs from **claim 28** in that it is not clear Aravamudan teaches checking availability by reference to a

status marker of a presence tuple among a plurality of presence tuples of presence information maintained

by a presence service although Aravamudan does teach to keep status information for plurality of devices

for each client in the presence service database(s) and refers to using standard instant message (IM)

software and IM standards in the system (column 1, lines 50-58; column 5, lines 15-17) as well as to

status of each device, and the address thereof (column 7, lines 16-21.

Day teaches data model for systems which support presence and instant messaging services, such

as a system of Aravamudan, Day teaches (via 2.4 and figure 5) checking availability of a status marker of

a presence tuple among a plurality of presence tuples of presence information maintained by a presence

service. Presence information is defined as containing a number of elements called tuples, each tuple has

a status marker (such as online), a communication address, (device and address) which could be a

telephone number (2.4) for example. This shows that Aravamudan does check availability of clients by

maintaining status marker (online presence) in a presence tuple (with respect to each client device among

plurality of client devices of the client (multiple tuples) serviced. (Column 7, lines 17-20 refers to the

CSP updating the database to indicate users presence, which device, and the address)

It would have been obvious if it is not inherent to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to modify the invention of Parvulescu as modified in view of Aravamudan to

organize the presence data of the users in a multiple tuple structure such as taught by Day because the

tuple structure of organization for the presence data is an accepted instant message standard as taught by

Day and would enable all programmers to follow a specific organizational structure allowing easier

compatibility among different instant message software

10.   **Claims 30 and 32** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aravamudan

and in view of Day et al. (RFC 2778).

Regarding **claims 30 and 32**, Aravamudan as applied to **claims 8** and 15 differs from **claims 30**

and 32 respectively in that it is not it is not clear Aravamudan teaches checking availability by reference

to a status marker of a presence tuple among a plurality of presence tuples of presence information

maintained by a presence service although Aravamudan does teach to keep status information for plurality

of devices for each client in the presence service database(s) and refers to using standard instant message

(IM) software and IM standards in the system (column 1, lines 50-58; column 5, lines 15-17) as well as

to status of each device, and the address thereof (column 7, lines 16-21.

Day teaches data model for systems which support presence and instant messaging services, such

as a system of Aravamudan, Day teaches (via 2.4 and figure 5) checking availability of a status marker of

a presence tuple among a plurality of presence tuples of presence information maintained by a presence

service. Presence information is defined as containing a number of elements called tuples, each tuple has

a status marker (such as online), a communication address, (device and address) which could be a telephone number (2.4) for example. This shows that Aravamudan does check availability of clients by maintaining status marker (online presence) in a presence tuple (with respect to each client device among plurality of client devices of the client (multiple tuples) serviced. (Column 7, lines 17-20 refers to the CSP updating the database to indicate users presence, which device, and the address)

It would have been obvious if it is not inherent to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Aravamudan to organize the presence data of the users in a multiple tuple structure such as taught by Day because the tuple structure of organization for the presence data is an accepted instant message standard as taught by Day and would enable all programmers to follow a specific organizational structure allowing easier compatibility among different instant message software

Allowable Subject Matter

11.   **Claims 17-22, 29, 31, and 33** are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and to be rewritten to avoid the confusion as noted above. **Claims 23-27, 34-35, and 37-40** are allowable, the reasons appropriately indicated in paper #12 and below. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art of record at this time does not teach retrieving from storage and sending the designation signal used to designate the recipient to the recipient of the voice message as pertains to claims 17 and 23, claims 18-22 and 24-27, and 34-35 respectively depend from and further limit the subject matter from which they depend.

Conclusion

12.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to Gerald Gauthier whose telephone number is (703) 305-0981. The examiner can normally

be reached on 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan

Tsang can be reached on (703) 305-4895. The fax phone number for the organization where this

application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained

from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available

through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

GERALD GAUTHIER
PATENT EXAMINER

g.g.

June 14, 2004

FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600